



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,621	11/01/2001	Lawrence A. Denenberg	23484-018	5081

7590 02/07/2006

Thomas M. Sullivan, Esq.
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

EXAMINER

ALBERTALLI, BRIAN LOUIS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/029,621	Applicant(s) DENENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian L. Albertalli	Art Unit 2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 30, 2005 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendments to the claims have been entered.

However, there appears to be an error in the copy of the claims submitted November 30, 2005. Previously, the Applicant had submitted an after final amendment on August 24, 2005. In the August 24, 2005 amendment, independent claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23 had been amended to include the limitation of providing the user with repeatable access to a bookmark. In the claims submitted November 30, 2005, the term "repeatable" has been removed from claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23. However, the Applicant's arguments submitted November 30, 2005 argue that Breitenbach et al. do not teach providing *repeatable* access to a bookmark location (see page 12, 2nd paragraph of Applicant's arguments). Since the most recent claims submitted by the Applicant (November 30, 2005) do not require that the user be provided with *repeatable* access to the bookmark, the Applicant's arguments regarding Breitenbach et al. are

considered moot and the rejections of claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23 in view of Breitenbach et al. are upheld.

Additionally, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner has assumed that the "repeatable" limitation was intended to be included in the amendment submitted November 30, 2005. This assumption would correspond with the Applicant's arguments submitted November 30, 2005 that Breitenbach et al. do not teach providing *repeatable* access to a bookmark location. New grounds of rejection are made for claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23 below, assuming that claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23 include the "repeatable" limitation, as in the amendment submitted on August 24, 2005.

Response to Arguments

3. As explained above, the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23 as presented in the amendment submitted November 30, 2005 are not persuasive because the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., providing *repeatable* access to a bookmark) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 29-36 as presented in the amendment submitted November 30, 2005, the Applicant's arguments are persuasive, therefore the rejections made in

the previous Office Action are withdrawn (rejected in view of Breitenbach and additional references). However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made.

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 10, 17, 22 and 23 as presented in the amendment submitted August 24, 2005 (i.e. with the *repeatable* limitation) are considered moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

4. To summarize, the following is a listing of the various combinations used in the rejections below:

Claims 1-8, 10-20, and 22-27 are rejected as being anticipated by Breitenbach et al., assuming claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 do not include the "repeatable" limitation.

Claims 9, 21, and 28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Breitenbach et al., in view of the Applicant's admitted prior art, assuming claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 do not include the "repeatable" limitation.

Claims 1, 10-18, 22, and 23 are rejected as being anticipated by Packingham et al., assuming claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 do include the "repeatable" limitation.

Claims 2-8 and 24-27 are rejected as being unpatentable over Packingham et al., in view of Anupam et al., assuming claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 do include the "repeatable" limitation.

Claims 9 and 28-36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Packingham et al., in view of Anupam et al., and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art, assuming

claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 do include the "repeatable" limitation, and claims 29, 31, 33, and 35 are as presented in the amendment submitted November 30, 2005.

Claims 19-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Packingham et al., in view of Official Notice.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 3 objected to because of the following informalities:

In line 3, "accessing" should be --access--.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 25 is objected to because "said pointer" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 25 should be amended to be dependent from claim 24 (i.e. "The article of manufacture of claim 24"), so as to remain consistent with corresponding claims 1-9 and to resolve the antecedent basis issue.

7. Claim 27 is objected to because "the modified representation" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 27 should be amended to be dependent from claim 26 (i.e. "The article of manufacture of claim 26), so as to remain consistent with corresponding claims 1-9 and to resolve the antecedent basis issue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 (In Response to Claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 as submitted November 30, 2005)

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-8, 10-20, and 22-27 (as submitted November 30, 2005, i.e. without the “repeatable” limitation) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Breitenbach et al. (U.S. Patent 6,775,358).

In regard to claims 1, 10, and 23, Breitenbach et al. disclose a method for providing a bookmark in a voice application (Fig. 6), a server (Fig. 1) with a processor programmed to perform the method, and an article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code comprising:

presenting the voice application to a user (step 622, content, also referred to as topics and stories, are rendered to the caller, column 16, line 64 to column 17, line 5, see also column 16, lines 38-39);

allowing the user to access the voice application and provide vocal input to the voice application (the user navigates the application through utterances, column 17, lines 9-11 and lines 29-30);

creating, upon a user request, a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with vocal input provided to the voice application (step 622 ends when the user interrupts normal playback with a voice command, and a history record is updated, column 17, lines 43-53); and

providing the user with access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location (at a later time, the user can resume call playback from the last point in the history record, column 14, lines 24-29 and lines 36-39).

In regard to claims 2 and 24, Breitenbach et al. disclose saving a pointer to the voice application (topics/stories rendered by the telephone server are stored, column 17, lines 22-25); and

saving a representation of vocal input by the user to the voice application up to the bookmarked location in the voice application (the utterances the caller entered to navigate the playlist are stored, column 17, lines 29-30).

In regard to claims 3 and 25, Breitenbach et al. disclose using said pointer to access the voice application (the history record is parsed to determine what channel, and thus what topic/stories should be accessed, column 15, lines 3-13, and lines 34-36; and column 16, lines 1-3); and

replaying the representation of the interactions to progress through the voice application substantially up to the bookmarked location (the user has the option to

playback content that has already been played, column 15, lines 38-41 and column 16, lines 18-23).

In regard to claim 4 Breitenbach et al. disclose the voice application includes VoiceXML code (content is rendered as VoiceXML output, column 16, line 64 to column 17, line 5).

In regard to claims 5 and 26, Breitenbach et al. disclose saving a modified representation of a page of the voice application that includes substantially all results of the vocal inputs up to the bookmarked location (an updated history record including user utterances is saved, column 17, lines 29-30 and lines 46-53).

In regard to claims 6 and 27, Breitenbach et al. disclose executing the modified representation of the voice application (the updated contents of the current history record are parsed, column 17, lines 54-63).

In regard to claims 7 and 8, Breitenbach et al. disclose the voice application and modified voice application include VoiceXML code, column 17, lines 42-53).

In regard to claims 11-13, Breitenbach et al. disclose the user inputs navigation commands through utterances, and that text data is synthesized by a voice synthesizer (column 17, lines 4-5 and lines 29-30). The system (Fig. 1, 100) must inherently include

the necessary speech processing device, analog to digital converter, and analog to digital converter to operate.

In regard to claim 14, Breitenbach et al. disclose a telephony interface coupled to the processor for sending and receiving audio signals to the user (Fig. 1, 104, column 4, lines 4-8).

In regard to claim 15, Breitenbach et al. disclose the voice application resides on a remote host, further comprising a telephony interface coupled to the processor for transmitting and receiving audio signals to and from the remote host, respectively (see Fig. 1, telephone 104 is clearly remote from the system 100).

In regard to claim 16, Breitenbach et al. disclose the voice application resides on a remote host, further comprising a TCP/IP stack coupled with the network and the processor, the TCP/IP stack for transmitting and receiving data to and from the remote host, respectively (content is provided from the content providers 108 through the internet 102, thus system 100 must inherently include a TCP/IP stack, since TCP/IP is the protocol used to communicate over the Internet, column 4, lines 56-57).

In regard to claim 17, the limitations of the claim are the same as claims 10-16, and thus are rejected for the same reasons.

In regard to claim 18, Breitenbach et al. disclose means for storing one or more bookmarks of the user (mass storage 150 stores a history record archive, column 5, lines 18-23).

In regard to claims 19 and 20, Breitenbach et al. disclose the means for storing include random access memory and magnetic data storage medium (column 7, lines 7-11).

In regard to claim 22, the limitations of the claim are the same as claims 10-16, and thus are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (In Response to Claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 as submitted November 30, 2005)

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 9, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breitenbach et al, in view of the Applicant's admitted prior art.

In regard to claims 9 and 28, over Breitenbach et al. disclose saving the entries to a history record when the history record is created, and determining the contents of

Art Unit: 2655

the history record by parsing the entire history record (Fig. 6, step 614, column 15, lines 5-11).

Breitenbach et al. do not disclose the use of a checksum.

The Applicant's admitted prior art discloses using a checksum for detecting when stored information has changed is widely known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Breitenbach et al. to generate a first checksum when the history record was created, then compare that to a second checksum generated when the history record was accessed, in order to quickly determine the final state of audio playback without having to parse the entire history record, while adding only a small amount of extra information (the size of the checksum) to the history record.

In regard to claim 21, Breitenbach et al. do not explicitly disclose the means for storing includes an optical data storage, but the Applicant's admitted prior art discloses that it is notoriously well known and recognized in the art that optical storage provides a compact, long lasting, and quickly accessible means for storing data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Breitenbach et al. to includes means for storing on optical data storage, in order to provide a compact, long lasting, and quickly accessible means for storing data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 (In Response to Claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 as submitted August 24, 2005)

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1, 10-18, 22, and 23 (with claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 including the “repeatable” limitation) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Packingham et al. (U.S. Patent 6,985,865).

In regard to claims 1 and 23, Packingham et al. disclose a method and an article of manufacture for providing a bookmark in a voice application, the method comprising:

presenting the voice application to the user (a VXML application is executed for a caller, column 13, lines 49-58);

allowing the user to access the voice application and provide vocal input to the voice application (the caller is allowed to provide various commands to the VXML application, column 13, lines 16-43 and column 14, lines 20-30);

creating, upon a user request, a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with vocal input provided to the application (the caller requests to create a bookmark by selecting “Save”, and the URI of the VXML document that the user was

accessing, through vocal input to the application, is saved as a bookmark, column 15, lines 9-15);

providing the user with repeatable access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location (the "Recall" option allows the user to return to the bookmarked location, repeatedly, column 15, lines 22-42).

In regard to claim 10, Packingham et al. disclose an apparatus for providing a user access to a voice application through a computer network, comprising:

a server coupled to the computer network (Fig. 1, system layer 14), wherein the server has a processor that is programmed to:

allow the user to access the voice application and provide vocal input to the voice application (the caller is allowed to provide various commands to the VXML application, column 13, lines 16-43 and column 14, lines 20-30);

create, upon a user request, a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with vocal input provided to the application (the caller requests to create a bookmark by selecting "Save", and the URI of the VXML document that the user was accessing, through vocal input to the application, is saved as a bookmark, column 15, lines 9-15);

provide the user with repeatable access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location (the "Recall" option allows the user to return to the bookmarked location, repeatedly, column 15, lines 22-42).

In regard to claim 11, Packingham et al. disclose a speech processing device coupled to the processor (SR engine 36, column 9, lines 16-18).

In regard to claims 12 and 13, Packingham et al. disclose an analog to digital converter coupled to the processor, wherein the analog to digital device has an audio input for receiving an analog audio signal from the user and a digital to analog converter coupled to the processor, wherein the digital to analog device has an audio output for sending an analog audio signal to the user (column 9, lines 3-9).

In regard to claim 14, Packingham et al. disclose a telephony interface coupled to the processor for sending and receiving audio signals to the user (communication interface 20, column 8, line 64 to column 9, line 3).

In regard to claim 15, Packingham et al. disclose the voice application resides on a remote host, further comprising a telephony interface coupled to the processor for transmitting and receiving audio signals to and from the remote host, respectively (applications 30 reside on a network, column 9, lines 25-30).

In regard to claim 16, Packingham et al. disclose the voice application resides on a remote host, further comprising a TCP/IP stack coupled with the network and the processor, the TCP/IP stack for transmitting and receiving data to and from the remote

host, respectively (applications 30 may reside on the Internet, which inherently would require a TCP/IP stack for communicating data, column 9, lines 25-30).

In regard to claim 17, Packingham et al. disclose an apparatus for providing a user access to a voice application through a computer network (Fig. 1), comprising:
a server coupled to the computer network (system layer 14), the server including:
a processor and associated memory (processor 22);
a speech processing device coupled to the processor (SR engine 36, column 9, lines 16-18);

communication means coupled to the processor for receiving and sending analog signals to and from the user, respectively (communication interface 20 includes the required A/D and D/A converters, column 8, line 64 to column 9, line 7); and

network interface means for transmitting and receiving signals to and from a voice application on a remote host, respectively (cache 28, column 9, lines 25-30);

wherein the processor includes:

means for allowing the user to access the voice application and provide vocal input to the voice application (the caller is allowed to provide various commands to the VXML application, column 13, lines 16-43 and column 14, lines 20-30);

means for creating, upon a user request, a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with vocal input provided to the application (the caller requests to create a bookmark by selecting "Save", and the URI of the VXML document

that the user was accessing, through vocal input to the application, is saved as a bookmark, column 15, lines 9-15);

means for providing the user with repeatable access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location (the "Recall" option allows the user to return to the bookmarked location, repeatedly, column 15, lines 22-42).

In regard to claim 18, Packingham et al. disclose means for storing one or more bookmarks from the user (Fig. 2, user profile store 52 stores a set of one or more bookmarks, column 14, lines 54-58).

In regard to claim 22, Packingham et al. disclose a system for providing a user access to a voice application through a computer network (Fig. 1) comprising:

a voice portal server coupled to the computer network (system layer 14), the server including:

a processor (processor 22);

a speech processing device coupled to the processor (SR engine 36, column 9, lines 16-18);

communication means coupled to the processor for receiving and sending analog signals to and from the user, respectively (communication interface 20 includes the required A/D and D/A converters, column 8, line 64 to column 9, line 7); and

network interface means for transmitting and receiving signals to and from a voice application on a remote host, respectively (cache 28, column 9, lines 25-30);

wherein the processor is programmed to:

allow the user to access the voice application and provide vocal input to the voice application (the caller is allowed to provide various commands to the VXML application, column 13, lines 16-43 and column 14, lines 20-30);

create, upon a user request, a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with vocal input provided to the application (the caller requests to create a bookmark by selecting "Save", and the URI of the VXML document that the user was accessing, through vocal input to the application, is saved as a bookmark, column 15, lines 9-15);

provide the user with repeatable access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location (the "Recall" option allows the user to return to the bookmarked location, repeatedly, column 15, lines 22-42); and

an application server having the voice application (applications 30 are stored remotely on, for example, the Internet, column 9, lines 27-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (In Response to Claims 1, 10, 17, 22, and 23 as submitted August 24, 2005 and Claims 29-36 as submitted November 30, 2005)

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 2-8 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Packingham et al, in view of Anupam et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,912).

In regard to claims 2 and 24, Packingham et al. disclose saving a pointer to the voice application (when a bookmark is created the URI of the VXML document is saved, column 15, lines 9-15).

Packingham et al. do not disclose saving a representation of vocal input by the user to the voice application up to the bookmarked location in the voice application.

Anupam et al. disclose a method for saving a bookmark in a voice application (see column 13, lines 21-29), that saves a representation of a user's input up to the bookmarked location in the voice application (column 6, lines 12-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to save a representation of the vocal input by the user up to the bookmarked location in a voice application, so a user could save a shortcut to a page that requires multiple steps to be retrieved, thus relieving the user from providing multiple inputs each time the bookmarked location was accessed, as taught by Anupam et al. (column 1, lines 46-52 and lines 55-67).

In regard to claims 3 and 25, Packingham et al. disclose using said pointer to access the voice application (the URI saved in the bookmark is used to access the document, column 15, lines 22-28).

Packingham et al. do not disclose replaying the representation of interactions to progress through the voice application substantially up to the bookmarked location.

Anupam et al. disclose replaying the representation of interactions to progress through the voice application substantially up to the bookmarked location (the navigation provided by the user's input and saved in the bookmark is played back for the user, column 12, lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to replay a representation of the interactions to progress through the voice application substantially up to the bookmarked location, so the user can automatically proceed through the interactions up to the bookmark without having to manually enter each input, as taught by Anupam et al. (column 9, lines 5-10).

In regard to claim 4, Packingham et al. disclose the voice application includes VoiceXML code (VXML, column 15, lines 9-15).

In regard to claims 5 and 26, Packingham et al. is silent as to the format of the saved bookmark.

Anupam et al. disclose saving a modified representation of a page of the voice application (a representation of the bookmark data is saved as a page, column 7, lines 41-44; this representation includes XML pages for voice, column 13, lines 21-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to save a modified representation of a page of the voice application, so the bookmark could be interpreted directly by a voice browser, rather than having to provide a standalone bookmark interpreter.

In regard to claims 6 and 27, Packingham et al. do not disclose executing the modified representation of the voice application.

Anupam et al. disclose executing the modified representation of the voice application (the page containing the bookmark data is loaded at playback, column 9, lines 11-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to execute the modified representation of the voice application, so the bookmark could be interpreted directly by a voice browser, rather than having to provide a standalone bookmark interpreter

In regard to claim 7, Packingham et al. disclose the voice application includes VoiceXML code (VXML, column 15, lines 9-15).

In regard to claim 8, Packingham et al. disclose the voice application includes VoiceXML code (VXML, column 15, lines 9-15).

Packingham et al. is silent as to the format of the saved bookmark.

Anupam et al. disclose saving a modified representation of a page of the voice application (a representation of the bookmark data is saved as a page, column 7, lines 41-44; this representation includes XML pages for voice, column 13, lines 21-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to save a modified representation of a page of the

voice application, so the bookmark could be interpreted directly by a voice browser, rather than having to provide a standalone bookmark interpreter. Furthermore, saving a modified representation of a voice application which included VoiceXML code, the modified representation would necessarily include VoiceXML code.

16. Claims 9 and 28-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Packingham et al., in view of Anupam et al, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

In regard to claims 9 and 28, Packingham et al. do not disclose the use of a checksum to determine if the content of the voice application has changed.

Anupam et al. disclose pages change constantly, and bookmarks need to be robust to changes in the underlying pages (column 9, lines 37-45 and column 10, lines 13-18).

Packingham et al. and Anupam et al. do not disclose using checksums to determine if the content of the voice application has changed.

The Applicant's admitted prior art discloses using a checksum for detecting when stored information has changed is widely known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify the combination of Packingham et al. and Anupam et al. to generate a first checksum when the history record was created, then compare that to a second checksum generated when the history record was accessed, in order to quickly determine the final state of audio playback without having to parse the entire history

Art Unit: 2655

record, while adding only a small amount of extra information (the size of the checksum) to the history record.

In regard to claims 29 and 31, Packingham et al. disclose a method and apparatus for providing a bookmark in a voice application, the method and apparatus comprising:

- allowing a user to request a page of the voice application (the user calls the platform containing a root VXML application, column 13, lines 49-53);

- loading the page of the application (the program is run when the user calls, column 13, lines 49-53);

- saving a URL of the page (creating a bookmark stores the URI of the VXML document the user is accessing, column 15, lines 9-15);

- providing to the user a prompt of the page (initial menu of choices, column 13, lines 54-58);

- obtaining a voice response from the user (column 14, lines 23-30);

- processing a voice response from the user (the user speaks "Bookmark" to begin the bookmark creation process, column 15, lines 1-6);

- creating the bookmark to the page of the voice application if the voice response of the user through the voice application indicates that the user desires to create a bookmark to the page (the Save option allows a user to create a bookmark, column 15, lines 9-15), wherein creating the bookmark includes:

requesting from the user a name for the bookmark (column 15, lines 16-19); and

saving the bookmark including the name of the bookmark, and the URL of the application (the URI of the application, column 15, lines 25-27); and accessing, by the user, the page of the voice application using the bookmark after saving the bookmark (using the Recall option, column 15, lines 29-33).

Packingham et al. do not disclose saving the response from the user.

Anupam et al. disclose a method for saving a bookmark in a voice application (see column 13, lines 21-29), that saves a representation of a user's input up to the bookmarked location in the voice application (column 6, lines 12-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to save a representation of the vocal input by the user up to the bookmarked location in a voice application, so a user could save a shortcut to a page that requires multiple steps to be retrieved, thus relieving the user from providing multiple inputs each time the bookmarked location was accessed, as taught by Anupam et al. (column 1, lines 46-52 and lines 55-67).

Anupam et al. further disclose pages change constantly, and bookmarks need to be robust to changes in the underlying pages (column 9, lines 37-45 and column 10, lines 13-18).

Packingham et al. and Anupam et al. do not disclose using checksums to determine if the content of the voice application has changed.

The Applicant's admitted prior art discloses using a checksum for detecting when stored information has changed is widely known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify the combination of Packingham et al. and Anupam et al. to generate a first checksum when the history record was created, then compare that to a second checksum generated when the history record was accessed, in order to quickly determine the final state of audio playback without having to parse the entire history record, while adding only a small amount of extra information (the size of the checksum) to the history record.

In regard to claims 30 and 32, Packingham et al. disclose clearing saved information and loading another page if the response of the user indicates that the user desires to load another page (the Edit option allows a user to delete saved information, column 15, lines 43-48).

In regard to claims 33 and 35, Packingham et al. disclose a method and apparatus for providing a bookmark in a voice application, the method and apparatus comprising:

allowing a user to request a page of the voice application (the user calls the platform containing a root VXML application, column 13, lines 49-53);

loading the page of the application (the program is run when the user calls, column 13, lines 49-53);

Art Unit: 2655

providing to the user a prompt of the page (initial menu of choices, column 13, lines 54-58);

obtaining a voice response from the user (column 14, lines 23-30);

processing a voice response from the user (the user speaks "Bookmark" to begin the bookmark creation process, column 15, lines 1-6);

creating the bookmark to the page of the voice application if the voice response of the user through the voice application indicates that the user desires to create a bookmark to the page (the Save option allows a user to create a bookmark, column 15, lines 9-15), wherein creating the bookmark includes:

requesting from the user a name for the bookmark (column 15, lines 16-19); and

saving the bookmark including the name of the bookmark, and the URL of the application (the URI of the application, column 15, lines 25-27); and

accessing, by the user, the page of the voice application using the bookmark after saving the bookmark (using the Recall option, column 15, lines 29-33).

Packingham et al. do not disclose saving a representation of vocal input by the user to the voice application up to the bookmarked location in the voice application.

Anupam et al. disclose a method for saving a bookmark in a voice application (see column 13, lines 21-29), that saves a representation of a user's input up to the bookmarked location in the voice application (column 6, lines 12-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to save a representation of the vocal input by the user up to the bookmarked location in a voice application, so a user could save a shortcut to a page that requires multiple steps to be retrieved, thus relieving the user from providing multiple inputs each time the bookmarked location was accessed, as taught by Anupam et al. (column 1, lines 46-52 and lines 55-67).

Furthermore, Packingham et al. are silent as to the format of the saved bookmark.

Anupam et al. disclose saving a modified representation of a page of the voice application (a representation of the bookmark data is saved as a page, column 7, lines 41-44; this representation includes XML pages for voice, column 13, lines 21-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to save a modified representation of a page of the voice application, so the bookmark could be interpreted directly by a voice browser, rather than having to provide a standalone bookmark interpreter.

Anupam et al. further disclose pages change constantly, and bookmarks need to be robust to changes in the underlying pages (column 9, lines 37-45 and column 10, lines 13-18).

Packingham et al. and Anupam et al. do not disclose using checksums to determine if the content of the voice application has changed.

The Applicant's admitted prior art discloses using a checksum for detecting when stored information has changed is widely known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify the combination of Packingham et al. and Anupam et al. to generate a first checksum when the history record was created, then compare that to a second checksum generated when the history record was accessed, in order to quickly determine the final state of audio playback without having to parse the entire history record, while adding only a small amount of extra information (the size of the checksum) to the history record.

In regard to claims 34 and 36, Packingham et al. disclose clearing saved information and loading another page if the response of the user indicates that the user desires to load another page (the Edit option allows a user to delete saved information, column 15, lines 43-48).

17. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Packingham et al., in view of Official Notice.

Packingham is silent as to the means for storing the bookmarks.

Official notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to store data, including bookmarks, in random access memory, magnetic data storage, and optical data storage.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Packingham et al. to store the bookmarks in one of random access

Art Unit: 2655


memory, magnetic data storage, or optical data storage because each provides a compact and efficient means for storing data.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian L. Albertalli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7616. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, every second Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on (571) 272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


WAYNE YOUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

BLA 2/3/06